DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 616 UD 023 252

AUTHOR Halasa, Ofelia
TITLE Reading Strategy Project. ECIA Chapter 1. Evaluation Report, 1982-83.
INSTITUTION Cleveland Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Research and Analysis.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; *Compensatory Education; *Diagnostic Teaching; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *Reading Skills; Remedial Programs; Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS Cleveland Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

The Reading Strategy Project in Cleveland, Ohio, is designed to assist upper elementary school pupils who have deficits in basic reading skills as reflected in performance on city-wide reading tests. The project design is based on an "in-class model" in which the reading strategy teacher and the classroom teacher work as an instructional team utilizing a diagnostic-prescriptive approach. Alternative approaches are used in selected schools. In the 1982-83 school year, the project served 3978 public (grades 4-6) and 318 nonpublic (grades 1-8) pupils. Participants enhanced their reading comprehension scores on the California Test of Basic Skills significantly more than would have been expected under Chapter 1 treatment conditions, and observed gains exceeded the project's criterion. The project appeared to be more effective with pupils pretested at or below 41 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) units than with those pretested above that level. Furthermore, the size of the gains was influenced both by the model used and by the grade level. Finally, both project and classroom teachers were very supportive of the project, and teachers rated the project very highly in terms of improving pupils' basic reading skills and making teachers aware of pupils needs. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Fleming
Cleveland Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED237616

READING STRATEGY PROJECT

ECIA CHAPTER I

1982-83
EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by

Ofelia Halasa
Project Evaluator

Typed by

Arlene Copeland

Cleveland Public Schools

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

August, 1983

UD023252

READING STRATEGY PROJECT

1982-83 Chapter 1 Evaluation Report

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

The Reading Strategy Project is designed to assist upper elementary pupils who have deficits in basic reading skills as reflected in performance on city-wide reading tests. The project design is based on an "In Class Model" in which the Reading Strategy teacher and classroom teacher work as an instructional team utilizing a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to instruction. Alternative approaches, i.e. Language Experience in Reading, Multi-Motivational Centers and the STAR Hoffman Reading Program are operational in selected schools.

SERVICE SUMMARY

Pupils Served: 4,296
(3,978 Public and
318 Non-Public)

Grades Served: 4-6 Public
1-8 Non-Public

Years in Operation: 9½

Schools: 58
(50 Public and 8 Non-Public)
(Refer to Appendix A to listing of schools)

Staffing:
1 Project Manager, FT
5 Consultant Teachers, FT
64 Reading Strategy Teachers, FT
2 Speech Therapists, FT, 1 PT
1 Psychologist, PT
2 Clerks, FT
1 Parent Education Counselor, FT
2 Educational Aides
1 Staff Aide

Total Chapter 1 Expenditures: *

Per Pupil Cost: *

SUMMARY

A total of 4,296 (3,978 public and 318 non-public) pupils attending 50 public and 8 non-public schools were served by Chapter 1 Reading Strategy during the 1982-1983 school year. Project participants enhanced their CTBS Reading Comprehension scores significantly ($p<.01$) more than would have been expected under non-Chapter 1 treatment conditions. Observed gains exceeded the projected objective criterion of 4 NCE gains. The Reading Strategy Project appears to be more effective with pupils pretesting at or below 41 NCE units regardless of model than with participants pretesting above 41 NCE units. The size of the gains however, is influenced by the model and grade level. Both project and regular classroom teachers were very supportive of the project efforts. Teachers rated the project very highly in terms of improving pupils' basic reading skills and making teachers aware of pupils needs.

---

*Expenditure data was not available at the time of the preparation of this report.

- Process Objective 1: The Reading Strategy Project will be implemented in public and non-public Chapter 1 elementary schools serving pupils with greatest need.

  - Outcome: This objective was achieved. A total of 4,296 pupils (3,978 public and 318 non-public) from fifty public and eight non-public schools received Reading Strategy services. Schools were selected on basis of highest incidence of poverty. All schools met the district poverty index criterion.

- Process Objective 2: Four Reading Consultants will be assigned to public schools, each one to serve a group of schools, to assist Reading Strategy teachers and parents.

  - Outcome: A total of five FTE Reading Consultants were assigned to assist Strategy consultants at the 50 public elementary schools and 8 non-public schools. Interviews with project staff revealed that school assignments per consultant were based on the total number of schools to be served, the total number of teachers to be served, the number of new teachers, the distance to be traveled, etc. Current schools assignments per consultant vary from 11 to 14. As in the past, consultants assist Reading Strategy Teachers in all areas including provision of materials, supplies, technical assistance with the teaching of reading, making arrangements for consultation services to parents, and participation in parent programs when requested. Regular inservice is provided to project staff (Appendix B).

- Process Objective 3: Pupils with reading deficiencies in upper elementary grades will be identified by use of program selection criteria.

  - Outcome: This objective has been achieved. City-wide test data was used to identify those students scoring at or below the thirty-third percentile on the CTBS Comprehension Subtest. In some schools where there are available spaces, performance on the Stanford Diagnostic Comprehension at Grade 4 as an alternate criterion.

    Test scores reported for a sample of project students (N=388) who were administered the reading attitude test indicated their mean performance to be at the 29 NCE unit or at the 17th percentile rank.

. Process Objective 4: A diagnostic-prescriptive plan will be generated for each pupil eligible for services.

. Outcome: This objective is achieved. Teachers' survey responses and interview responses of the project manager and selected teacher consultants indicated that Diagnostic Reading Probes were used to plan lessons for pupils at grades 4-5. Pretest data from the Curriculum for Improving Student Study skills (CISS) and the accompanying item analysis results were used to plan lessons for pupils in Grade 6 enrolled in the STAR Hoffman Centers. Reading Strategy plans devised for each pupil, reinforced comprehension skills, regardless of the model.

. Process Objective 5: Fifty-nine Reading Strategy Teachers will provide "direct" practice within the classrooms, reinforcing the prescriptive lessons presented by the classroom teachers and assisting pupils toward mastery and maintenance of skills.

. Outcome: The objective was attained. Responses of 49 project staff respondents indicated that almost all 92% utilized the diagnostic prescriptive approach. A comparable number of regular classroom teachers also indicated that they were using the same approach. The enthusiasm of teachers about this approach is reflected in the high ratings (5 as High to 1 as Low) of effectiveness about this approach relative to the following:

Statement	Mean Rating
— Increase teacher's awareness of reading needs.	4.1
— Improves pupils' basic reading skills.	4.1
— Diagnoses pupils' strength and weakness.	4.2
— Improves pupils' reading habits.	3.9
— Reinforces the teaching of reading objectives.	4.4

. Product Objective 1a: Participating pupils in grades four, five, and six will evidence an average post treatment score that is at least four NCE units above expectancy. Data for each grade will be based on regression analyses of test data from the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) Comprehension subtest, administered in April, 1982 and in April, 1983.

. Outcome: Objective 1[1] was attained on a program-wide basis (Table 1). The application of regression analysis (Model C) of Spring 1982 and 1983 test data are provided on Table 1 by grade. However, there were distinct differences between grades which appears to be a function of the model that will be detailed in the following pages.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF REGRESSION DATA BY GRADE

Grade	N	Predicted $\bar{X}$ NCE	Observed $\bar{X}$ NCE	NCE Gain	t-Value
4	787	30.10	34.76	4.66	4.67*
5	1165	31.58	38.29	6.71	14.47*
6	202	34.76	43.62	8.86	9.09*

*$p<.01$

[1] To assess progress toward the attainment of the objective, the test performance of students served by the project was compared with an estimate of what their test performance would have been if they had not participated. This "expected" level of performance was obtained by conducting a regression analysis on the test scores of a comparison group of students who scored above 41 NCE units on the CTBS pre-test who were not served by the project, and Reading Strategy students who scored less than 41 NCE units on the pre-test. This analysis made it possible to predict Reading Strategy students' performance on the Spring, 1983 administration of the CTBS from their performances on the Spring, 1982 administration of CTBS. Their actual scores on the Spring, 1983 CTBS were then compared with their expected scores to determine if participation in the project had raised their performance above the level that would have been expected if they had not participated.

Analysis of Grade 4 Data

Chapter 1 Reading Strategy participants with complete Spring 1982 and 1983 test data are noted on the following table:

TABLE 2

OBSERVED MEAN NCE COMPREHENSION SCORES: GRADE 4

Group	N	Spring '82*	Spring '83*
Comparison Group	2991	58.01	51.82
Participants	787	31.89	34.76
In Class	556	30.34	33.44
Multi-Motivational	62	30.74	37.66
Language Experience	88	31.05	41.45
Hoffman	81	28.92	34.35

*Level 1 (s) Administered in Spring, 1982
Level 2 (S) Administered in Spring, 1983

The application of regression analysis to these data indicated that gains above expectancy were easily achieved in all models except for the In-Class Model. As evident from Table 3, gains above expectancy ranged as high as 8.58 NCE units for Language Experiences in Reading (LEIR) to 3.32 NCEs for the In-Class model.

TABLE 3

1982-1983 REGRESSION DATA: GRADE 4

Group	N	Predicted $\bar{X}$ NCE	Observed $\bar{X}$ NCE	NCE Change	t-Value
Comparison Group	2991	52.12	51.82	-.30	-1.20
Reading Strategy Models	787	30.10	34.76	4.66	4.67*
In Class	556	30.12	33.44	3.32	5.65*
Multi-Motivational	62	30.44	37.66	7.22	3.98*
Language Experience	88	32.87	41.45	8.58	4.14*
Hoffman	81	28.99	34.34	5.35	3.76*

*P<.01

Analysis of Grade 5 Data

Chapter 1 Reading Strategy participants with complete Spring 1982 and 1983 test data are noted on the following table.

TABLE 4

OBSERVED MEAN NCE COMPREHENSION SCORES: Grade 5

Group	N	Spring '82*	Spring '83*
Comparison Group	2736	54.47	53.55
Participants	1165	31.89	38.29
In Class	783	28.50	38.00
Multi-Motivational	118	29.10	41.30
Language Experience	96	26.24	33.18
Hoffman	168	30.19	40.46

*Level 1 (S) Administered in Spring, 1982
Level 2 (T) Administered in Spring, 1983

The application of regression analysis to these data indicated that gains above expectancy were easily achieved in all models except for the Language Experience Model. As evident from Table 5, gains above expectancy ranged as high as 9.32 NCE units for Multi-Motivational Centers to 3.63 NCE units for Language Experience in Reading Model.

TABLE 5

1982-1983 REGRESSION DATA: Grade 5

Group	N	Predicted $\bar{X}$ NCE	Observed $\bar{X}$ NCE	NCE Change	t-Value
Comparison Group	2736	52.76	53.55	0.49	1.30
Reading Strategy Models	1165	31.58	38.29	6.71	14.47*
In Class	783	31.48	38.00	6.52	11.59*
Multi-Motivational	118	31.99	41.30	9.32	6.81*
Language Experience	96	29.55	33.18	3.63	2.14**
Hoffman	168	32.90	40.46	7.55	6.01*

*P<.0001 **P<.03

Analysis of Grade 6 Data

Chapter 1 Reading Strategy participants with complete Spring 1982 and 1983 test data are noted on the following table.

TABLE 6

OBSERVED MEAN NCE COMPREHENSION SCORES: Grade 6

Group	N	Spring '82*	Spring '83*
Comparison Group	2948	54.88	54.12
Reading Strategy Hoffmann	202	29.89	43.62

*Level 1 (T) Administered in Spring, 1982
Level 2 (S) Administered in Spring, 1983

The application of regression analysis to these data indicated gains above expectancy was easily achieved for the Hoffmann Strategy students. As evident from Table 7, Hoffmann Strategy participants demonstrated nine NCE gains above expectancy.

TABLE 7

1982-1983 REGRESSION DATA: Grade 6

Group	N	Predicted $\bar{X}$ NCE	Observed $\bar{X}$ NCE	NCE Change	t-Value
Comparison Group	2948	54.24	54.12	-.11	-.58
Reading Strategy Hoffmann	202	34.76	43.62	8.86	9.09*

*P<.001

. Product Objective 1b: Participating non-public school pupils in grades four through eight will show a pre-post mean gain of at least seven NCE units of basic achievement in reading (comprehension subtest) during the 1982-83 school year, based on performance on the (SDRT) Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (Green Level A-grade 4, Brown Level A-grade 5 through 8). Appropriate norms will be used to convert pre and post scores to NCE units.

. Outcome: This objective was achieved at grades 3-6, but not at grades 7-8. Change scores based on total Comprehension (Literal and Inferential) subtest ranged from 11.97 (grade 6) to .48 (grade 7) NCE units (Table 8). Subsequent examination of pre-post scores achieved on the Literal and Inferential subtests revealed that mean gains exceeded the criterion of seven NCE unit consistently at grades three, four and six (Table 8). Findings were mixed for grades 5, 7, and 8. Differences between the pre- and post- mean NCE score were usually statistically significant beyond the .001 level, in favor of post scores (See Appendix C-1).

TABLE 8

PRE-POST NCE MEANS AND NCE CHANGE SCORES BY GRADE
FOR NON-PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS

	SDRT Literal			SDRT Inferential			SDRT Comprehension		
Grade	Pre	Post	Change	Pre	Post	Change	Pre	Post	Change
3	32.27	43.28	11.01*	33.22	40.84	7.62*	32.04	41.98	9.94*
4	33.65	43.44	9.79*	33.72	46.28	12.56*	33.09	44.47	11.38*
5	33.62	42.59	9.57*	36.26	42.18	5.92	34.72	42.16	7.44*
6	28.82	43.89	15.07*	31.82	42.00	10.18*	30.57	42.54	11.97*
7	40.58	42.86	2.28	39.08	39.41	.33	39.29	39.77	.48
8	26.50	35.50	9.00*	32.58	34.33	1.75	28.25	34.00	5.75
Average	32.98	42.73	9.83*	34.46	41.92	7.46*	32.04	41.93	9.89

*Objective attained.

- Product Objective 2: Randomly selected participating pupils in identified grades will demonstrate significantly improved attitudes towards reading as reflected in the comparison of mean pre/post test responses on a locally constructed Pupil Attitude Survey.

  - Outcome: This objective was not attained. Differences between samples of project participants (N=299) and non-participants (N=56) did not meet significance in four out of five reading measures. In Reading as Enjoyment, the comparison group showed significantly higher ratings ($p<.05$) than did the participants. It should be noted however, that participants whose weakness in reading skills could be expected to have less-than-positive reading attitudes, reported post mean scores that were comparable to those of the comparison group.

TABLE 9

ANCOVA F-VALUES FOR PRE-POST ATTITUDE READING MEASURES

Attitude Measures	Treatment		F-Value
	Experimental (N=299)	Comparison (N=56)	
Reading Anixety	2.38	2.23	.35
Reading Difficulty	2.67	2.58	.83
Reading as Reinforcement	4.04	3.93	.35
Reading as Enjoyment	3.42	3.72	4.14**
Reading Group	4.30	4.37	.27
Average	3.36	3.37	.24

Based on a weighted three point rating scale by Walbrown et. al. with 5 as the more positive, 3 as neutral and 1 as the more negative.
**$p<.01$

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

1. Spring 1983 Vs. Spring 1982 CTBS Comprehension NCE change scores (Appendix E): Data based on a comparison of pre-post Comprehension NCE scores (as opposed to regression data presented earlier) should be read and interpreted with caution. Participants with initial scores at or below 41 NCEs (33rd %ile) demonstrated higher change scores than did comparable groups of non-participants: The following key findings are noted:

- In-class participants pre-testing at or below the 41 NCE showed comparable gains (3.11) as did comparable regular non-project participants (3.39). This finding is unlike that at grade 5 where In-class participants showed higher change scores (9.50) than did the Regulars (7.75).

- The effectiveness of the model for pupils pre-testing below 41 NCE units varied with the grade. At grade 4, the LEIR participants showed the largest gains as compared to the other models. At grade 5, the MMC participants showed the largest gains as compared to the other models.

- Eligible project participants (initial scores at or below 41 NCE) in selected models at grades 4-5 showed larger gains than comparable non-project participants. Eligible fourth grade participants in these models (MMC, LEIR and Hoffmann) showed gains ranging from 6.92 to 10.41 NCE, while regular pupils reported only 3.39 NCE gains. At grade 5, eligible participants attending In-class, MMC and Hoffmann models reported NCE gains ranging from 9.50 to 12.20, while comparable non-project participants showed a gain of 7.45 NCE units.

- Eligible project participants in sixth grade attending the Hoffmann model evidenced higher NCE gains (13.73) than did comparable non-project participants (10.62).

- Non-project participants with initial scores at or below 41 NCE units demonstrated gains of 3.39 NCEs at grade 4, 7.45 NCEs at grade 5, and 10.62 NCEs at grade 6. Observed gains of this group was much greater than that of participants with initial scores above 41 NCEs: which may be a function of the regression effects (non-project participants qualifying for Chapter 1 services may be served by other special reading projects).

2. The number of participants with initial selection scores above 41 NCEs dropped from 455 in 1981-1982 to 107 in 1982-1983.

3. Teachers have very positive opinions about the project. The major contributions of this project that were identified most frequently (Refer to Appendix for details) are:

- Motivates/boosts self-concept
- Provides individualized instruction
- Diagnoses reading deficits that can be addressed immediately.

4. Parent survey responses (N=141) reported favorable opinions about the project as noted below (See Appendix E):

- Most of the parents (77%) reported that there was a satisfactory reading improvement observed during the 1982-1983 school year and an even higher proportion expressed satisfaction with the progress of their children (see Appendix F).

- Many of the parents (64%) reported that their children had made positive comments about the project teacher such as "...helps improve reading..." and "...encourages child to work harder in reading."

- About half (53%) of the parents attended projects, parent meetings and reported the meetings to be informative and helpful.

CONCLUSIONS

A total of 4.396 (3,978 public and 318 non-public) pupils attending 50 public and 8 non-public schools were served by Chapter 1 Reading Strategy during the 1982-1983 school year. Project participants enhanced their CTBS Reading Comprehension scores significantly ($p<.01$) more than would have been expected under non-Chapter treatment conditions. Observed gains exceeded the projected objective criterion of 4 NCE gains. The Reading Strategy Project appears to be more effective with pupils pre-testing at or below 41 NCE units regardless of model, than with participants pre-testing above 41 NCE units. The size of the gains, furthermore is influenced by the model to which participants are exposed to and in which grade level. Both project and regular classroom teachers were very supportive of the project efforts. Project teachers rated the project very highly in terms of improving pupils basic reading skills and making teachers aware of pupils needs.

The following recommendations are offered for future project operations:

- Continue to explore the effectiveness of the different models used in the project.

- Consider the use of common evaluation instrument and evaluation design to allow for more valid comparisons among different reading projects. A total of 3201 pupils who had initial scores at or below 41 NCEs were not served by the project (607 at 4th grade, 894 at 5th and 1700 at 6th grade). These non-project participants had NCE gains considerably lower than those obtained by Strategy participants. This suggests that Reading Strategy project may be a more appropriate treatment for this group of non-project pupils as compared to other reading programs.

- Develop more refined and detailed criteria for determining in which of several alternate programs a particular child will be placed. For instance, the implementation of several reading programs that have different emphasis and different processes, and which are at the same schools and at the same grades (e.g. Diagnostic Reading, STAR) continues to point the need for articulating more explicity those procedures and criteria for determining which pupil should be assigned to which of several alternate reading programs.

- Consider teachers' recommendations calling "...for strengthening coordination efforts of classroom teachers and Strategy Consultants, providing separate classrooms for Strategy classes, reduction of paper work and modifying the selection process, and providing joint inservice for both classroom and Strategy teachers..."

APPENDIX A

LISTING OF READING STRATEGY SCHOOLS

1. Adlai Stevenson
2. Anthony Wayne
3. Artemus Ward
4. Benjamin Franklin
5. Brooklawn
6. Buhrer
7. Case
8. Chesterfield
9. Clark
10. Cleve. Sch. of Arts
11. Cranwood
12. Daniel E. Morgan
13. East Madison
14. Emil B. deSauze
15. Euclid Park
16. Forest Hill Parkway
17. Fullerton
18. Garfield
19. Geroge W. Carver
20. Gordon
21. Gracemount
22. Halle
23. Henry W. Longfellow
24. Kenneth Clement
25. Kentucky
26. Lafayette Cont. Acad.
27. Margaret Ireland
28. Marion-Sterling
29. Mary B. Martin
30. Mary Bethune
31. McKinley
32. Memphis
33. Miles Park
34. Milford
35. Mt. Pleasant
36. Nathaniel Hawthorne
37. Oliver H. Perry
38. Orchard
39. Paul Revere
40. Robert Fulton
41. Stephen E. Howe
42. Sunbeam
43. Tremont
44. Union
45. Wade Park
46. Walton
47. Warner
48. Watterson-Lake
49. William R. Harper
50. Willow

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. Blessed Sacrament
2. Immaculate Conception
3. Lutheran Memorial
4. Our Lady of Mt. Carmel
5. Our Lady of Peace
6. St. Paul Croation
7. St. Phillip Neri
8. St. Timothy

APPENDIX B

LISTING OF INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

Date	Topic	No. of Participants
09/09/82	General Meeting of Staff & Teachers	71
09/09/82	Language Experience	5
09/09/82	Multivational Cultural Centers	5
09/13/82	Hoffman Lab Workshop	20
09/14/82	Hoffman Lab Workshop	20
10/21/82	General Meeting of Staff & Teachers	70
10/21/82	Language Experience	5
10/21/82	Multivational Cultural Centers	5
10/21/82	Special Committee	3
10/21/82	Non-Public Staff Meeting	6
11/03/82	Outside Consultant	6
11/04/82	Hoffman Teachers Inservice	14
11/18/82	General Meeting Staff/Development	71
11/18/82	Multivational Cultural Centers	6
11/18/82	Program Planning	7
12/16/82	General Meeting Staff/Development (Supportive Staff)	74
01/20/83	General Meeting (Competency Testing)	70
01/2?/83	Multivational Cultural Centers	5
01/17/83	Computer Strategy	71
03/11/83	Show Case of Materials (Diagnostic Reading Probes)	72
04/21/83	Monthly Meeting Share Fair	65
04/29/83	Non-Public Inservice (Testing)	7

Date	Topic	No. of Participants
05/17/83	Hoffman Lab Inservice	28
05/18/83	Hoffman Lab Inservice	34
05/19/83	Hoffman Lab Inservice	35
06/16/83	Monthly Meeting - Project Evaluation (Survey) Planning	60

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83 PAGE 3

FILE READING (CREATION DATE = 07/11/83) STRATEGY BY OFELIA HALASA

- T - T E S T -

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	2-TAIL CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
VOC2	49	46.4490	18.184	2.598	5.6939	16.723	2.389	0.551	0.000	2.38	48	0.021
VOC1		40.7551	17.043	2.435								
LIT2	49	43.2857	16.851	2.407	11.0204	15.650	2.236	0.447	0.001	4.93	48	0.000
LIT1		32.2653	11.752	1.679								
INF2	49	40.8367	15.778	2.254	7.6122	14.968	2.138	0.458	0.001	3.56	48	0.001
INF1		33.2245	12.470	1.781								
TOT1	49	32.0408	11.797	1.685	-9.8776	14.756	2.108	0.396	0.005	-4.69	48	0.000
TOT2		41.9184	14.691	2.099								

- -

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83

TRANSPACL REQUIRED.. 2876 BYTES
5 TRANSFORMATIONS
115 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
3 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

ELAPSED TIME REQUIRED.. 7.64 SECONDS

Grade 4

***** T-TEST PROBLEM REQUIRES 224 BYTES OF WORKSPACE *****

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83 PAGE 5

FILE READING (CREATION DATE = 07/11/93) STRATEGY BY OFELIA HALASA

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	2-TAIL CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TA PRO
VOC2												
	43	44.2558	17.543	2.675	4.6512	13.880	2.117	0.634	0.000	2.20	42	0.0
VOC1		39.6047	14.043	2.141								
LIT2												
	43	43.4419	16.087	2.453	9.7907	15.626	2.383	0.371	0.014	4.11	42	0.0
LIT1		33.6512	10.535	1.607								
INF2												
	43	46.2791	18.178	2.772	12.5581	16.809	2.563	0.405	0.007	4.90	42	0.0
INF1		33.7209	9.859	1.504								
TOT1												
	43	33.0930	9.479	1.446	-11.3721	14.090	2.149	0.429	0.004	-5.29	42	0.0
TOT2		44.4651	15.259	2.327								

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83

TRANSPACE REQUIRED.. 100 BYTES
1 TRANSFORMATIONS
0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
3 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

ELAPSED TIME REQUIRED.. 3.25 SECONDS

16

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83 PAGE 7

FILE READING (CREATION DATE = 07/11/83) STRATEGY BY OFELIA MALASA

T-TEST

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	2-TAIL CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
VOC2		43.6047	12.713	1.939								
	43				2.8605	14.412	2.198	0.360	0.018	1.30	42	0.200
VOC1		40.7442	12.765	1.947								
LIT2		42.5116	11.825	1.803								
	43				9.4884	13.792	2.103	0.419	0.005	4.51	42	0.000
LIT1		33.0233	13.616	2.076								
INF2		42.1628	10.184	1.553								
	43				5.9070	12.239	1.866	0.324	0.034	3.16	42	0.003
INF1		36.2558	10.845	1.654								
TOT1		34.7209	10.642	1.623								
	43				-7.3953	10.402	1.586	0.480	0.001	-4.66	42	0.000
TOT2		42.1163	9.703	1.480								

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83

TRANSPACE REQUIRED.. 100 BYTES
1 TRANSFORMATIONS
0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
3 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

ELAPSED TIME REQUIRED.. 2.03 SECONDS

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83 PAGE 9

FILE READING (CREATION DATE = 07/11/83) STRATEGY BY OFELIA HALASA

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	2-TAIL CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
VOC2	27	40.7037	11.658	2.244	-1.7037	11.478	2.209	0.674	0.000	-0.77	26	0.448
VOC1		42.4074	15.445	2.972								
LIT2	28	43.8929	10.996	2.078	15.0714	13.589	2.568	0.467	0.031	5.87	27	0.000
LIT1		28.8214	13.633	2.576								
INF2	28	42.0000	11.408	2.156	10.1786	16.940	3.201	0.050	0.801	3.18	27	0.004
INF1		31.8214	13.104	2.476								
TOT1	28	30.5714	10.720	2.026	-11.9643	12.137	2.294	0.264	0.175	-5.22	27	0.000
TOT2		42.5357	9.179	1.735								

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83

TRANSPACE REQUIRED.. 100 BYTES
1 TRANSFORMATIONS
0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
3 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

ELAPSED TIME REQUIRED.. 2.06 SECONDS

***** T-TEST PROBLEM REQUIRES 224 BYTES OF WORKSPACE *****

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83 PAGE 11

FILE READING (CREATION DATE = 07/11/93) STRATEGY BY OFELIA HALASA

- - - -

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83 PAGE 13

FILE RLADING (CREATION DATE = 07/11/83) STRATEGY BY OFELIA HALASA

T-TEST

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	2-TAIL CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
VOC2		36.2500	12.750	3.681								
	12				-7.0000	13.524	3.904	0.668	0.018	-1.79	11	0.100
VOC1		43.2500	18.157	5.241								
LIT2		35.5000	15.774	4.554								
	12				9.0000	12.526	3.616	0.616	0.033	2.49	11	0.030
LIT1		26.5000	11.350	3.276								
INF2		34.3333	10.688	3.085								
	12				1.7500	16.971	4.899	-0.099	0.760	0.36	11	0.728
INF1		32.5833	12.169	3.513								
TOT1		28.2500	11.299	3.262								
	12				-5.7500	13.519	3.902	0.295	0.352	-1.47	11	0.169
TOT2		34.0000	11.473	3.312								

ANALYSIS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING STRATEGY 07/11/83

TRANSPACE REQUIRED.. 100 BYTES
1 TRANSFORMATIONS
0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES
3 IF/COMPUTE OPERATIONS

ELAPSED TIME REQUIRED.. 2.78 SECONDS

ERROR NUMBER.. 1360. PROCESSING CEASES, ERROR SCAN CONTINUES.

TRANSPACE REQUIRED.. 100 BYTES
1 TRANSFORMATIONS
0 RECODE VALUES + LAG VARIABLES

APPENDIX C- 2

SUMMARY OF TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES (7=102)
ECIA CHAPTER I READING STRATEGY PROJECT
1982-1983

. Identity of Respondent (mark/circle appropriate response):

(1) 48(47%) Reading Strategy Teacher 50(49%) Regular Classroom Teacher
3(3%) Consultant

. School Assignment

(2) 85(83%) Public 4(4%) Non-Public — Both Public and Non-Public 13(13%) No Response

. Indicate the grade you teach (mark/circle appropriate grade or grades)

(3-4)

4 - 20 (20%)
5 - 22 (22%)
4 + 5 — 36 (35%)
6 - 5 (5%)
5 + 6 — 2 (2%)
4 + 5 + 6 7 (7%)
3 to 8 2 (2%)

. Are you using the diagnostic prescriptive approach? Mark one response only.

(5) 90 (88%) YES 5 (6%) NO 2 (2%) NOT SURE 3 (3%) Others

If No, why not? _____

_____

Mark the one model that is used in your classroom:

(6)

14 (14%) STAR Hoffman
15 (15%) Language Experiences in Reading
20 (20%) No Response
12 (11%) Multi-Motivational Centers
31 (30%) In-Class Model
10 (10%) Don't Know

. Rate the effectiveness of the Reading Strategy Project on a five-point rating scale using the following rating system:

(7)

36 (35%)	37 (36%)	9 (9%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	$\bar{X}$
5	4	3	2	1	2.24
Extremely Effective		Undecided		Not Effective At All	

Mark one rating for each of the three statements only.

	Statement	Rating					
(8)	Increase teacher's awareness of reading needs of pupils.	5	4	3	2	1	4.09

(9)	Improves pupil's basic reading skills.	5	4	3	2	1	4.16
(10)	Diagnoses pupils' strength and weaknesses.	5	4	3	2	1	4.28
(11)	Improves pupil' reading habits.	5	4	3	2	1	3.93
(12)	Reinforces the teaching of reading objectives.	5	4	3	2	1	4.41

Mark below the items you consider to be the major contributions of the Project to reading.

(13) 68 (67%) Focus on comprehension skills is critical to reading.

(14) 41 (40%) Improves pupils' basic reading skills, e.g. identifying and interpreting facts, distinguishing facts from opinions, etc.

(15) 66 (75%) Motivates and boosts positive self-concept.

(16) 74 (73%) Provides individualized instrcution based on diagnosted needs of pupils.

(17) 75 (74%) Pinpoints the deficits that can be addressed in small group instruction.

(18) 21 (21%) Others (Specify) _____

_____

_____

If changes in the Reading Strategy were to be implemented list three recommendations to improve future project operations:

_____

_____

See Attached

_____

APPENDIX C-2

TEACHERS' RECOMMENDATIONS

	Total	Responses Strategy Teacher	Responses Reg. Teacher
Improve coordination efforts of classroom teachers and Strategy Consultant.	17(16%)	8(47%)	9(53%)
Provide separate classroom for Strategy Consultant.	16(15%)	7(47%)	8(53%)
Integrate Strategy program with regular classroom to reduce class size for all.	5(5%)	1(20%)	4(80%)
Reduce project paper work.	6(6%)	6(100%)	—
Modify selection process recognize one test score not (4) sufficient.	12(11%)	5(42%)	7(58%)
Use better dignostic totals (3)			
Serve all with need regardless of test score (4)			
Serve those only in "adjusted" classes with in score (4).			
Modify treatment process	14(13%)	8(57%)	6(43%)
Provide service according to deficit skill (3).			
Focus at fourth grade skills deficit (1).			
Use beginning reading approach (2).			
Build on unmastered reading objectives (2).			
Better supervision of Strategy consultants (2).			
Limit Strategy model to LEAR (11).			
Need more materials (3).			
Modify Inservice	11(10%)	5(45%)	6(59%)
Schedule more inservice for both consultant and classroom teachers (3).			
Consider retaining toward certification (2).			
Provide more opportunities for Hoffman consultants to get together (2).			

	Total	Responses Strategy Teacher	Responses Reg. Teacher
Reduce inservice time.			
Reallocate time for serving more pupils (2).			
Allow for 5-10 minutes preparation time.			
Parent Involvement	3(3%)	—	3(100%)
Share pupil program with parents (2).			
Parent agencies (1).			
Others	21(21%)	16(76%)	5(24%)
Non-assignment of Strategy Consultants by principals to Non-Strategy jobs.			
Continue Hoffman classes.			
Schedule Strategy classes for the first class daily.			
Need more consultants.			
Provide aides to assist consultants.			

APPENDIX D-1

SUMMARY OF PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES (N=141)
ECIA CHAPTER 1 READING STRATEGY PROJECT

April 1982

Dear Parent:

Your child (children) is (are) presently receiving extra help from the Reading Strategy Teacher at his/her school. What do you think about the help your child is getting?

Your answer to the question below will enable us to know your opinions. Thank you.

- In what grade is your child who is receiving services from the Reading Strategy Project? (Circle one answer only)

3(2%) GRADE 3	56(40%) GRADE 4	55(39%) GRADE 5	18(13%) GRADE 6	1(4%) GRADE 7	— GRADE 8

79% at Grades 4-5

- What type of school does he/she attend?

(2) 124(88%) Public 16(11%) Non-Public

- Has your child's reading improvement been satisfactory this school year? (Check one answer only)

(3) 109(77%) YES 4(3%) NO 19(13%) NOT SURE

- How satisfied are you with your child's reading improvement?

(4)

43(31%) Very Satisfied	76(54%) Satisfied	17(12%) Undecided

1(< 1%) Dissatisfied 1(< 1%) Very Dissatisfied

Comments: SEE ATTACHED

- Were there comments made about Reading Strategy by your child? (Circle one answer only)

90(64%) YES 42(30%) NO 5(4%) NOT SURE

- If YES, mark the type of comments that were made. Mark all that apply as listed below.

(6) 76(54%) Helps child improve basic reading skills

(7) 53(38%) Helps child understand what the teacher is doing

(8) 81(57%) Encourages child to work harder in reading in the class

(9) 12(9%) Others (specify): _____

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

(10) • Did you attend any of the Reading Strategy meetings held for parents this school year at your child's school?

68(48%) YES 63(45%) NO

(11-12) If YES, how many? 1 = 40(28%), 23(16%), 3 - 3(2%) 7 - 1(< 1%)

If YES, what did you think of those meetings? Mark one answer only to the following statements below:

		YES	NO
(13)	Was the information provided useful for understanding the project?	77(55%)	—
(14)	Were the materials helpful?	73(52%)	—
(15)	Did the meetings help you know more about learning at school?	63(45%)	—

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF 1982-1983 NCE CHANGE SCORES ON THE
CTBS READING COMPREHENSION
BY MODEL BY GRADE

Level of Performance	Grade 4				Grade 5				Grade 6	
	In-Class	MMC+	LEIR+	Hoffmann+	In-Class	MMC+	LEIR+	Hoffmann+	In-Class	Hoffmann
At or Below 41 NCE (33rd %ile)										
Reading Strategy	3.11 (556)	6.92 (62)	10.41 (88)	5.42 (81)	9.50 (783)	12.20 (118)	6.95 (96)	10.28 (168)	-	13.73 (202)
Regular	3.39 (607)	-	-	-	7.45 (894)	-	-	-	10.62 (1700)	-
Above 41 NCE										
Reading Strategy	-.802 (50)	* (2)	* (4)	-14.62 (21)	-2.94 (17)	* (1)	-	5.10 (10)	* (1)	* (1)
Regular	-6.19 (2991)	-	-	-	-1.43 (2814)	-	-	-	-2.36 (2948)	-

*Limited - None

+MMC - Multi-Motivational Centers, LEIR - Language Experiences in Reading, Hoffmann - Hoffmann Labs

PARENTS' COMMENTS RE: READING STRATEGY

"The Reading program have helped her to know more words, pronounce them better and read better."

"My daughter is repeating the fifth grade and I think for the second time in Reading Strategy her reading grade should be better than a D."

"I can see some improvement however, cannot sound out words she misspells them and cannot read them. She cannot sound them out well enough to look in a dictionary."

"He still has problems with words he hasn't seen before and some common basic words."

"I feel my child was reading very well or very good before she started this class, at the begining she read a book to me every day and she's been doing that every sense she started to read."

"It has really helped my son I notice a very big improvement in his reading."

"I have not been contacted by the instructor, and is unaware of any improvement. I would rather be aware of what is being taught, so that I may reinforce what my child is learning or not learning."

"I was unaware of any program. I haven't seen any reading materials."

"I'm not sure and undecided because of the C on my child report card in reading. Yes, there were comments made by my child, he's expressed that the reading program gave him more confidence in his reading. My child reads more at home on his own, he enjoys reading and wants to bring his grade up in reading and we both fell the Reading Strategy will help."

"My fourth grader is reading more at home."

"He now reads more books and likes reading them and he also understands."

"I feel it has helped my son read and understand much better."

"My child reads a lot better than she did last year, and a lot clearer and she understands what she's reading."

"My child seems to have trouble with some words I think he should know how to pronounce."

"I feel that the reading class has helped my child to understand what he is reading and to get more out of reading by the materials, machines, and the teachers help."